

The Home Depot company is justly proud that it has contributed to Parra's success, as well as that of fellow employee Tristan Gale, who won a gold medal in the women's skeleton event. In fact, the company has hired and given job flexibility to 140 Olympics and Paralympics hopefuls throughout the country in a display of corporate patriotism and civic involvement. Twenty of those hopefuls were in Salt Lake City.

The company's Olympic Job Opportunity Program offers full-time pay and benefits to athletes for a 20-hour week during competition and training seasons. Not surprisingly, Home Depot managers have found these dedicated athletes are also among their most hard-working employees and in most cases would be delighted to have them back after the competition has ended.

Home Depot has joined many other U.S. companies in sponsorships that have helped show the world that it is possible to stage a successful Olympics without losses to public coffers or excessive commercialization. But The Home Depot has taken this civic spirit to the next level, supporting those dedicated athletes who are the centerpiece of the Olympic Games.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you and my colleagues to please join me in praising the American spirit of determination that led Derek Parra to shock the world and win gold and silver medals in record-breaking times at speedskating. And also in praising The Home Depot for showing the world that American business can join with athletes like Derek to bring success and pride to them both.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRENSHAW). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO FALLEN HEROES IN THE WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is written that, "If you owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect."

I can think of no more fitting time to apply this verse than today, 1 day after we as Americans watched the flag-draped caskets of seven U.S. servicemen being off-loaded from a C-130 transport plane at Ramstein Air Force Base in Germany. We owe these men of the United States Special Forces and the 101st Airborne a great debt of honor, a debt that words on this floor cannot even begin to repay.

A century and a half ago, Abraham Lincoln spoke on another battlefield where American soldiers had spilled their blood to preserve our liberty. In his address, Lincoln charges the survivors of the conflict as follows:

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work

which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

Mr. Speaker, the soldiers who died in the mountains of Afghanistan laid down their lives for the same great task as the soldiers at Gettysburg, the preservation of our liberty and our very way of life.

Throughout our history, Mr. Speaker, America has faced enemies of her peace and her freedom. Two decades ago, President Ronald Reagan encouraged a country beset by terrorism. The words of his first inaugural address should steel the resolve of Americans today who face a similar intractable enemy.

President Reagan said, "As for the enemies of our freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it, but we will not surrender for it now or ever. And, above all else, we must realize no arsenal, no weapon in the arsenals of the world, is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. It is a weapon our adversaries in today's world do not have. It is a weapon that we as Americans do have."

Mr. Speaker, it is especially poignant to me, as I see the sacrifices in the 101st Airborne, to reflect that twice in the last 6 months I traveled, at the invitation of Major General Richard Cody, to Fort Campbell, Kentucky, the home of the Screaming Eagles. There I met with officers and enlisted men of that fabled division, perhaps maybe even some of the very same soldiers that are coming home in the silence of death to their families, men who we can say without a doubt did not lack the will or moral courage to preserve our way of life.

I opened with a scripture verse. Allow me to close with one, Mr. Speaker. As we consider the lives of those who have had paid the ultimate price to secure our freedom, I am reminded of the verse that, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he should lay down his life for his friends."

And allow me to add these modest words on behalf of the people of eastern Indiana and a grateful Nation. To the grieving spouses, parents, children, and friends that these heroes have left behind, we commend them humbly for their sacrifice as families and for having in their midst those who have shown no greater love to that dream which is the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LIBERAL BIAS IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it was reported last week that an invitation to author Doris Kearns Goodwin to speak at the University of Delaware's commencement exercises had been withdrawn. This invitation was pulled because Ms. Goodwin has admitted that her books contain many sentences, facts, even whole paragraphs plagiarized from other writers.

But today, Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned as much about Ms. Goodwin's plagiarism or shoddy research as about what the invitation to her says about almost all of our colleges and universities.

It is well-known that Ms. Goodwin colors her history with a very strong liberal bias. We will soon be in the season of college and university graduation ceremonies. If my colleagues have ever looked at a list of commencement speakers, they have seen almost immediately that almost all come from a very liberal or left-wing background. Two or three years ago, Evergreen State college in Washington State even invited as its speaker a man who had been convicted of killing a policeman.

Conservative speakers are almost never invited to speak at commencement or graduation exercises. People who started businesses with nothing or very little, and thus tend to be very conservative, are almost never invited to speak. The only business leaders who are ever invited are those from extremely big business and who can safely be identified as liberal or at least very politically correct. I know there are always a few exceptions, but I would guess that liberals outnumber conservatives 50 or 100 to 1 as speakers at graduation ceremonies.

This reflects the fact that there is less true academic freedom, at least for conservatives, on U.S. college campuses than anyplace else in U.S. society today. College faculties, at best, have only a few token conservatives in fields that deal with political questions. Even professors in nonpolitical fields, such as English, often work in comments or assign books that show their liberal bias.

The very liberal bias of our national news media has been well documented and is not even questioned today. However, there is a much greater or stronger liberal or left-wing bias on most college and university faculties than even in the national news media. Conservative students, unless they are unusually courageous, learn very quickly to, many times, remain silent or not express their true opinions in statements they make or papers that they write.

Most colleges and universities have gone to great lengths to make sure minorities are well represented in their faculties and that they have diversity, and that is fine. But the most discrimination today is against conservative

professors and speakers, especially at very liberal schools like Antioch, Oberlin, the University of Colorado, and some of the Ivy League schools.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that colleges and universities around this Nation will strive for full diversity and true academic freedom by allowing at least a few token conservatives onto their faculties, or at least as graduation speakers.

IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY TO LATINO COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the importance of Social Security and how it impacts the Latino population throughout this country.

We must remember that the initial intent and purpose of the Social Security retirement system was to help alleviate the poverty among our elderly Americans and to meet the retirement needs of all workers. We must not forget the severe poverty that our seniors suffered prior to Social Security. Social Security has become the single most effective Federal anti-poverty program in our history, lifting more than 11 million seniors out of poverty.

Latinos are critically affected by any proposed changes in the Social Security System. A significant segment of the workforce, Latinos, and especially Latinas, women, represent a disproportionate percentage of those who lack employer pension coverage. We, as Hispanics, tend to work in small companies, small businesses, which do not have pensions. We are underrepresented in government jobs and for that reason do not have a lot of the pensions that others do. More than other segments of the population, Latinos depend heavily on Social Security to live their senior years in dignity.

The Latino population is growing rapidly. Currently, Latinos constitute 8 percent of the total U.S. workforce, and by 2010 Latinos are projected to account for 13.2 percent of all the workers. From 1997 to the year 2020, the number of Latinos that are aged 65 will double.

Unfortunately, despite the gains in education and other areas, Latinos still remain concentrated in low-wage jobs that provide few benefits. While more than 51 percent of Anglos workers have employer pension coverage, the same is true for only one-third of the Latino workers. Accordingly, Latino retirees are more than twice as likely as Anglo retirees to rely solely on Social Security benefits as a means of economic support.

In addition, Latinos are less likely than Anglos to receive incomes from interest on savings and investments. For example, in 1998, of all the persons reporting interest income, only 5.3 percent went to Latinos.

I would like to also applaud the efforts of some groups that are looking at the impact that any changes in Social Security will have on women. While reforming the Social Security System, we have serious implications for women, and especially Latinas. The women in our community, Latinas, may be the most severely impacted of all populations. The Latinas are more likely than other women to work inside the home and are less likely than other women to have retirement savings accounts.

Moreover, Latinas are less likely than other workers to have access to private pension coverage, and they tend to receive the lowest wages of any group in the work force. Relying heavily on Social Security benefits, changes in marital status or the loss of a principal wage earner places Latinas in a particularly vulnerable situations.

Given the paramount importance of Social Security to Hispanic men and women, we must approach so-called reform efforts with caution, weighing the impact on this key, fast-growing population. I am concerned that the plans to privatize Social Security would drain needed resources from the Social Security Trust Fund and jeopardize benefit payments to retirees, the blind, disabled workers and survivors.

The leading plan proposed by the administration's hand-picked Social Security commission would drain \$1.5 trillion from the trust fund in just the next 10 years, money that is already being used for other purposes. Privatization of Social Security would require cuts in guaranteeing Social Security benefits. The President's Social Security commission recommended a privatization plan that cuts benefits for future retirees by up to 46 percent. Everyone would be subject to these cuts, not just workers who choose to have individual accounts, and Latinos would be hit the hardest.

Social Security privatization would expose individual workers and their families to greater financial risks. Under privatization, benefit levels would be determined by the volatile stock market, by the worker's luck in making investments, and by the timing on his or her decisions to retire. In light of the Enron disaster, we know the risks.

Latinos, who are, more than other groups, dependent on Social Security as a guaranteed income stream in retirement, would lose under privatization.

Other proposals, while well-meaning, would not help us reach our goal of ensuring future solvency. I ask that, as we look at Social Security, we make sure we look at its impact on special populations as well as the baby boomers and what we consider the baby echos, those kids of those baby boomers.

PRESIDENT BUSH STANDS TALL FOR DOMESTIC STEEL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, allow me to take a moment to applaud President Bush for standing tall in favor of our domestic steel industry. He has, at a very critical moment, stood up for steel. If we have a domestic steel industry in coming decades, I believe it will be because of this courageous action and an administration that was willing to listen to steelworkers, listen to steel producers, and also listen to all other interested parties in order to craft a creative policy. He clearly listened to those who were calling for substantial relief for an industry in crisis. It has been running the risk of being hollowed out by unfair trade practices.

It is obvious that the President carefully weighed the issue. His judicious decision will provide breathing space to the domestic steelworkers and the industry. Enacting tariffs of up to 30 percent for most steel products provides help for those hardest hit by unfavorable conditions in the steel market. This administration has stepped up to the plate for the American steel industry and its workers, something that previous administrations, regrettably, had been unwilling to do.

Without the concrete actions taken by this President, the industry was facing a meltdown. The President recognized that the American steel industry and its workers have done their part in recent years. This is something that critics do not really willingly acknowledge, but the fact is our steel producers have taken dramatic steps to reduce inefficient capacity and modernize operations to become among the most productive steel producers in the world, with as few as one-and-a-half man hours needed per ton of steel produced.

□ 1515

That is an extraordinary transformation of an industry that was very inefficient a few decades ago.

To achieve these advances in productivity, the U.S. steel industry reduced capacity by more than 23 million tons, closed numerous inefficient mills, and significantly cut jobs. The workers have endured their fair share of pain and suffering as the workforce was reduced by hundreds of thousands of workers in an effort to become the most efficient producers of steel. But we all know that when competing with the unfair trading practices of some of our competitors, it was simply not enough.

Let us understand, Mr. Speaker, what the President did was WTO compatible. It was based on remedies approved by the International Trade Commission, and it utilized our 201 process, which the WTO contemplated. While opponents of this 201 action are crying foul, saying the cost will be prohibitive, Mr.